## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA **BILLINGS DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL EMTER,

Defendant.

CR 14-89-BLG-SPW

OPINION AND ORDER

Before this Court is Defendant Christopher Emter's Motion for Status Hearing, Detention Hearing (Doc. 46). Since his arraignment on November 5, Emter has elected to proceed with counsel. Despite having counsel, however, Emter filed the current motion pro se. Through his pro se filing, Emter engages in hybrid representation without first seeking this Court's permission. See United States v. Klee, 494 F.2d 394, 396-97 (9th Cir. 1974) (a criminal defendant does not have an absolute right to both self-representation and the assistance of counsel); see also United States v. Daniels, 572 F.2d 535, 540 (5th Cir. 1978) (whether to allow hybrid representation remains within the sound discretion of the trial judge). Under such circumstances, "[a] district court has no obligation to entertain pro se motions filed by a represented party." Abdullah v. United States, 240 F.3d 683, 686 (8th Cir. 2001).

This Court will not consider motions filed by Emter personally and declines to consider Emter's Motion for Status Hearing.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Emter's Motion for Status Hearing, Detention Hearing (Doc. 46) is DENIED in its entirety.

DATED this // day of March 2015.

SUSAN P. WATTERS

United States District Judge